

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-16, 18-25, 27-35, 37 and 38 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 2 and 6 were previously cancelled and remain cancelled.

In the Office Action of March 30, 2009, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-40 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 16, 20, 24, 29 and 32 are amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-16, 18-25, 27-35, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolzien* in view of *Zigmond* in view of *Alexander* in view of *Dureau* in view of *Del Sesto*.

Claims 7, 17, 26 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolzien* in view of *Zigmond* in view of *Alexander* in view of *Dureau* in view of *Del Sesto* in further view of *Marics*.

Claims 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wolzien* in view of *Zigmond* in view of *Alexander* in view of *Dureau* in view of *Del Sesto* in view of *Marics* in further view of *Goldschmidt*.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 16, 20, 24, 29, 32 and 35 recites furnishing access site information after confirmation that the access site information is stored in a database.

The Examiner correctly states that *Wolzien*, *Zigmond*, *Dureau* and *Alexander* do not disclose a database unit which stores access site information corresponding to a detailed information furnishing unit. See, Office Action at Page 6. Accordingly, *Wolzien*, *Zigmond*,

Dureau and *Alexander* also fail to disclose furnishing access site information after confirmation that the access site information is stored in a database.

Del Sesto, *Merics* and *Goldschmid*, similarly, fail to disclose anything pertaining to furnishing access site information **after confirmation that the access site information is stored in a database.** *Del Sesto* discloses a broadcast server which stores information which will be broadcast over a network. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,530,084, Col. 4, l. 14-38. *Maric* discloses a processor capable of connecting to the Internet and displaying web pages extracted from a broadcast signal on a television screen. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,862,611, Col. 5, l. 4-19. *Goldschmidt* discloses identifying a broadcast portion as a commercial message and stopping a recording device while the commercial message is broadcast. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,444, Col. 7, l. 48-67.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by furnishing access site information **after confirmation that the access site information is stored in a database.** access site information can be automatically retrieved from the database and a bill can be generated and sent to a customer for the information retrieved. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0069408 Para. [0070].

Therefore, because *Wolzien*, *Zigmond*, *Alexander*, *Dureau*, *Del Sesto*, *Maric* and *Goldschmidt* or any possible combination of them fails to disclose or even fairly suggest each of the features of claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 16, 20, 24, 29, 32 and 35, the rejection of claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 16, 20, 24, 29, 32 and 35 cannot stand. Because claims 3-4, 7-9, 11-12, 14-15, 17-19, 21-23, 25-28, 30-21 and 36-40 depend, either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 16, 20, 24, 29, 32 and 35, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 29, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000